

**Triggers Focus Group
Technical Issues Committee
Meeting Notes
11 January 2006**

Attendees:

Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker and Associates
Dania Huggins, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
John Swanson, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Margie Lopez-Read, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Matt Reeves, Department of Food and Agriculture

Telephone Attendees:

Marshall Lee, Department of Pesticide Regulation
Wendy Cohen, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
Debbie Liebersbach, Turlock Irrigation District
Elaine Archibald, Archibald Consultants
G. Fred Lee, G. Fred Lee & Associates
Lenwood Hall, University of Maryland
Mike Niemi, Modesto Irrigation District
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk

I. REVIEW OF MEETING NOTES FROM 15 DECEMBER 2005

A few edits and additions were made by the attendees, and changes will be noted before posting the meeting notes to the TIC website. This included some additional comments that had been made regarding follow-up to toxicity during irrigation season, and resampling for other exceedances, such as pH and DO.

II. TOPICS FOR FURTHER FOCUS GROUP DEVELOPMENT

The Focus Group members agreed that there are some Tentative MRP topics, which could be better clarified or have more discussion with ultimate recommendations. These include the following:

- A. Intent behind Storm Water monitoring. Clarification of this could lead to defining more appropriate triggers for coalitions to use for initiating storm water monitoring.
- B. Source Identification. Not all watersheds and all situations would benefit from the same approach. A variety of alternatives should be discussed and considered.
- C. Evaluating results for DO and pH. Options for appropriate averaging of results for these parameters should be discussed and considered for recommendations by the Focus Group.

III. CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS

The consensus of the Focus Group was that there were various components of the Tentative MRP which currently have prescriptive requirements, but that really do not lend themselves to a one-solution-fits-all approach. A clarification in the language of the MRP to describe the intent of the requirement, followed by a selection of acceptable alternatives might be a reasonable approach. The actual approach and specific alternatives could be selected by the coalition and presented in their MRP Plan – or a new alternative could be proposed, providing that it met the requirement's objectives.

Examples of the components in the Tentative MRP that could be addressed using this approach are:

- A. Storm Water Monitoring Triggers
 - Based on storm events after dormant spray application
 - First flush
 - Minimum rainfall levels per year
- B. Source Identification
 - After first hit, discuss with landowners and Ag Commission, and
 - Develop a forensic approach if problem persists through second monitoring event
 - Forensic monitoring at upstream locations, based on pre-determined rationale (eg: Bill Thomas' watershed sketches)
- C. Resampling and compliance Report options for exceedances during storm event monitoring
 - forensic monitoring upstream for larger watersheds, and alternative approaches for small watersheds, such as:
 - increase of monitoring frequency and location the following year
- D. Resampling and compliance reports during irrigation season
 - different approaches for different type monitoring parameters
 - magnitude, duration and averaging as concepts to be used in trigger development

The Focus Group also returned to a topic at prior meetings – that of the requirements for follow-up monitoring when the toxicity test results were between 0% mortality and 50%. The recommendation had been left on the table to utilize a 20% mortality of fathead minnow and water flea (and 20% reduction in growth) for algae, to mandate a resample of the same monitoring site. (Note that the requirement for submitting an Exceedance Report based on any significant toxicity was not recommended to be changed.

The Focus Group agreed to take the 20% trigger for resample concept forward to the TIC at the 24 January 2006 meeting as an additional recommendation.

V. NEXT STEPS

Stephen Clark of Pacific EcoRisk was nominated to provide the summary of the Focus Group recommendations to the TIC, and he accepted. These four recommendations will be brought forth by the group, with Stephen Clark as spokesperson at the 24 January 2006 meeting.

Other agreements were as follows:

1. Dr. Fred G. Lee will provide his information regarding the DO and pH averaging concept to the Focus Group members.
2. Dr. Lenwood Hall will provide a copy of (or link to) the study of pesticides in Orestimba Creek using three discrete monitoring sites over a period of approximately one year.
3. Margie Lopez Read will contact scientists working for other coalitions not already represented at the Focus Group regarding their approaches for source identification.

Topics that remain to be addressed through the Triggers Focus Group, the Laboratory Round Table group, or another include the following:

1. Electronic data submittal and reporting format requirements
2. Laboratory raw data submittals
3. Timing for Submittal of various technical reports
4. Response and submittal of reports for unidentified peaks (chromatographic analyses)
5. Exceedance report timelines for field monitoring data
6. Resampling timelines for field monitoring exceedances
7. Phased approach and long-term monitoring strategy
8. Evaluation of contaminants to be monitored, bacteriological, flow, load
9. Time frame allowance for MRP Plan revisions
10. Discussion of options for aerial photos
11. Discussion of signatory responsibilities and penalty of perjury, etc.

NEXT TELEMEETING DATE: To be determined following the 24 January 2006 TIC meeting.